



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

RECENT ASSYRO-BABYLONIAN LITERATURE

The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East. Manual of Biblical Archæology. By ALFRED JEREMIAS, Licentiate Doctor, Pastor of the Lutherkirche, and Lecturer at the University of Leipzig. English edition, translated from the second German edition, revised and enlarged by the author, by C. L. BEAUMONT, edited by Rev. Canon C. H. W. JOHNS, Litt. D., Master of Catharine's College, Cambridge. II volumes. New York: G. T. PUTNAM'S SONS, London, WILLIAMS AND NORRIS, 1911. pp. 683, with 214 illustrations and 2 maps.

THE theory of 'new ages' that we meet with so frequently in this book, suggests, by an association of ideas, that we too have entered upon a new age. Not many years ago, we lived in the age of the Higher Criticism. It is now replaced by that of Pan-Babylonism. Hugo Winckler, who ushered in this new era, deserves, like the Oriental heroes of antiquity, to be endowed with the qualities of a 'deliverer,' as he saves the Bible from enemies by which it was torn into shreds, in the preceding age. Who, however, will save it from this modern persecutor? For it is evident that another passing fancy, Pan-Babylonism, is becoming an important factor in biblical exegesis and it must be taken cognizance of by biblical students. But it is a laborious task to learn all about this theory from the numerous works of Winckler and his followers. We owe, therefore, a debt of gratitude to the author of this work who for the first time made an attempt to classify this system and to present an index of documentary references and proofs from other mythologies for the biblical interpretation. But, though only claiming to have elaborated Winckler's ideas into a system, the author is by no means as radical as the originator. The latter sees in the mythological *motifs* the basis of the biblical narratives, whilst

the author contends that they merely are used for the form of presentment, without eliminating the historical facts. This admission would be extremely valuable for biblical exegesis, if it were the result of scientific research. It looks, however, as if this standpoint is not that of the unbiased Lecturer at the University, but of the Pastor of the Lutherkirche in Leipzig. For in dealing with angelology, the author says as follows: "On the ground of the religious truths set forth in the Christian conception, and in review of the gospel records of the life of Jesus, we recognize realities of the transcendental world in the angelology of the Ancient-Israelite religion..... And when the cuneiform texts speak of 'the divine messengers of grace' who accompany the king in his campaign, or of 'the guardian of health and life' who stands at the king's side, they are representing a religious truth" (p. 53, II). We need not comment upon such a standpoint. The author thus holds that mythological motifs which adhere to the narrative, prove nothing against the historical probability of the whole fact. But the primitive tales must be judged differently from the legends of the fathers and the stories of the time before the kings, and these again differently from the stories of the time of the kings, lying in full light of history. The motifs form only an artificial part in the true historical books.

The present writer freely confesses that if given no alternative but to choose between the author's and Winckler's opinions, he would not hesitate to give preference to the latter. It is logical to assume that the movements of the stars were personified and presented as stories of certain heroes who never existed. But it taxes too strongly our credulity to believe that ancient writers were unable to present a simple, true story of a fight, without referring to 'the dismembering of the dragon,' the life of a warrior of flesh and blood, without endowing him with the *motifs* of a deliverer, etc., etc.

The designation 'Pan-Babylonian' is replaced in this book by 'Ancient-Oriental teaching,' but it still asserts that the astral doctrine issued from Babylonia, claiming that the oldest and clearest statements of it have been discovered in Babylonia, and it is founded upon astronomy which originated in this country. Thence

it spread out over the whole world, and exerting a different influence over every civilization, it developed into many new forms. Accordingly, the theory of a borrowed literature is to be abandoned. There can only be the question of a common mythological ancestry.

The chief aim of this book is to trace the Ancient Oriental teaching throughout the Old Testament, and for this purpose the author reconstructs the astral system, supporting each point by documentary evidence. This support is, however, though admirably ingenious, very weak. It may be characterized as circumstantial evidence, based by no means upon cuneiform texts, but gathered from figures of speech, the meaning of pictures, sense of the calendars, and here and there from late Greek and other writers. It is homiletic exegesis, similar to that of Talmud and Midrash, and in many respects identical with that of the Kabbalah. The author is fully aware of it, and believing that the Kabbalah had its starting-point in Babylonia, quotes in several places kabbalistic notions in support of his theories. But his acquaintance with kabbalistic ideas is very limited. The same may be said of his talmudic knowledge. He does not know that the main idea of this system 'word-*motifs* and play upon words' is identical with the main halakic principle applied in *נוירה שוה*. If true, it would show that the Talmud possessed the only right key to biblical interpretation. Pan-Babylonian scholars ought to make a special study of mediæval kabbalistic literature, of the *תיקוני הזוהר*, *זוהר*, and the works of Rabbi Isaak Loria and his followers. They will find abundance of material for their purpose. Let us take a few instances. The fundament of the system, seeing a pre-established harmony between a celestial and terrestrial image, the earth being a counterpart of heaven, is the leading thought of the Kabbalah. Even in the Talmud we often meet with the same idea, and it became, a halakic principle, in the sentence *מלכותא דארעא כעין מלכותא דרקיע* 'the earthly kingdom is a counterpart of the heavenly kingdom.' The theory of sacred numbers plays an exceedingly important part in the Kabbalah: 50 and 72—in Babylonian: 50 = Bêl, as completion of the cycle; $50 + 72 = \text{Saros}$, 3,600—are the most sacred numbers, 50 representing *המשישם שערי בינה* 'the 50 gates of reason,' 72 corresponding to *שם המפורש* 'the secret name of God.' 42 is

another שם המפורש mentioned in Talmud Kiddushin, transmitted only to initiates of highest character.¹ 13 is the numerical value of אחר, representing the unity and the 13 attributes of God. 14 corresponds to אחר עם הכולל, that is to say, the word itself counts as a unit. It will be of interest to New Testament students to learn that disciples of Jesus applied the same mystical numbers. In the genealogy of Jesus we are told that from Abraham to Jesus there were $3 + 14$ generations = 42. It undoubtedly indicates that the most holy name of God, having been proclaimed during 42 generations, was now fulfilled, as fulfilment of the name of God, in Talmud and Kabbalah, is a postulate for redemption. The $3 + 14$ contains in all probability an allusion to the Trinity-doctrine.

The idea that each of the planets can reflect the complete Divine power, is one of the main ideas of the Kabbalah. It is even more radical than the author's system. *Each* of the seven ספירות which undoubtedly correspond to the seven planets, not only Sin, Shamash, and Ishtar, contain, the power of all of them, thus becoming 49 חסד שבחסד, נבורה שבחסד, יסוד, 50 = God.² Thus we have חסד שבחסד, יסוד, etc., etc.

¹ The present writer has no doubt that it is the Divine Name אהיה אשר אהיה (Exod. 3, 14) by which God revealed Himself for the first time (in E) to Israel, as אהיה אהיה gives 42. This double-name (= Gemini, Sin and Nergal?) may have been brought in connection with the λογος-idea which is quaintly expressed in זוהר (Genesis p. 1a), where we find that from the אין סוף emanated אלהים, the creator of the world, hence the mystery surrounding this Name. אהיה placed in the Four Points of the universe, = 84, comprises all possible constellations, the seven planets multiplied by the 12 signs of the Zodiac. This שם המפורש may be seen as number-motif in the story of Elisha (II Kings 2, 24) where by his curse בשם ארני, 42 of the boys who derided him perished. In accordance with the motif, they were destroyed by two bears. We may even go a step farther, in the kabbalistic system, and maintain that רוב has the numerical value of אהיה, computed כספר קטן (= 12) where 1 counts only as a unit.

² It is quite systematical that God and Bêl should have the same numbers, as to the חמישים שערי טומאה correspond חמישים שערי קדושה. For in the Kabbalah, the סטרא אחרת ('the other side') is in every respect a counterpart of the סטרא דקדושה ('the holy side').

It would be a hopeless task to present in a review a satisfactory synopsis of the system, as the author himself devotes to this purpose 141 pages. We can only discuss salient points. The student, desiring to get a clear conception of these theories, will have a hard time, as one is easily bewildered by the descriptions of the constellations, the solstices, the equinoctial points, the diagrams, etc. Some points are still very vague and we would have expected a fuller discussion. This is especially the case in the calendar. We see that in the most remote times the vernal equinox was in the sign of Gemini. Accordingly, the year must have begun with Sivan and ended with Iyyar. From about 3000 down, the vernal equinox was in the sign of Taurus, and the year began with Iyyar. In the eighth century B. C., the vernal equinox retrograded into the sign of Aries, and by the reform of the calendar of Nabû-naṣir, the beginning of the year was transferred into Nisan. The question now arises: The Exodus having taken place in the age of Taurus, how could Nisan have been fixed as the beginning of the year? The simplest solution would be to assume that the Exodus took place in Iyyar, and it was the first month, but in Babylonia, by adopting the Babylonian calendar, the beginning of the year was advanced into Nisan. This suggestion might give some critics a plausible explanation for the institution of the second *Pesaḥ* in Iyyar. But it does not seem to be the opinion of the author, though the passage to which we refer is obscure and contradictory. He says: "We are inclined also to think that Exod. 12, 2 (Nisan as the first month) agrees with old methods = the Babylonian calendar (age of Taurus)" (vol. I, p. 46). Those who deny the antiquity of the Jewish religion, could add a further proof that the story of Exodus was invented in the age of Aries. One could also suggest that Nisan was fixed as the beginning of the year, before the arrival of the vernal equinox, in direct opposition to the current calendar, and as protest against the prevailing sun-worship, in the age of Marduk. From a conservative point of view, however, Nisan became the first month of the year, as being the month, when the Jews gained their freedom, and it coincided accidentally with the vernal equinox in the later age of Aries.

As a very weak point in this system we consider the fundamental idea that the primitive religion of the Ancient-Babylonians was founded upon and regulated by the movements of the stars. It presupposes that, in a very remote period, the Babylonian already possessed a perfect knowledge of astronomy, and consequently a high standard of civilization. Primitiveness and civilization are incongruous terms. Theories of this kind could only have been elaborated in a speculative age. Jastrow in his recent book 'Aspects of religious belief and practice in Babylonia and Assyria' maintains indeed that the rise of astronomy in Babylonia was due to Greek modes of thought. Quotations from Greek, Latin, and Mohammedan authors, concerning the Babylonian views of the universe, are not to be relied upon, as all of them lived in periods when the science of astronomy was already established everywhere. Late speculative ideas they have ascribed to antiquity, and primitive tales, interpreted as reflecting occurrences and phenomena in the starry heaven. The inferences from other mythologies are too hazy to build upon. Even if we should find in them some cognate features, they are due to the fact that all primitive peoples were worshipers of the astral bodies, and the same conditions and the same phenomena lead to the same conclusion.—Many interpretations of the Babylonian myths rest upon the assumption that *shupuk shamē* is the Babylonian name for the Zodiac. The present writer is not convinced of it, and would rather see in this term the mountain of the world, the link between heaven and earth, upon which the heaven was erected (see Jensen, KB., VI, p. 462). R. IV, 5, proves nothing against it, it means only when the gods were threatened by hostile powers, Sin, Shamash, and Ishtar as the most powerful gods, were entrusted with guarding the entrance to heaven. The passage: *Ishtar sha ina shupuk shamē naphat* 'Ishtar who rises in the *shupuk shamē*' evidently shows that it is a locality where only Ishtar rises and not the other planets. Hence it cannot be identical with the Zodiac where all planets rise.

We cannot approve of the author's method of making suggestions and then converting them into indisputable facts. Thus vol. I, p. 344, he mentions the columns of Ta'annek which were probably sprinkled with *oil* or *blood*, and vol. II, p. 104, he asserts that the

Canaanite *Asherim*, stricken with blood, give evidence of the striking of the doorposts with blood, in pre-Israelite Canaan. For the cosmic double-peaked mountain where the *nibiru-point* is said to be, we have in this book the only evidence in Babylonia in figure 11 which, as the author says, possibly shows the mountain, with the sun-god emerging from between the two peaks. There are many other points of the same kind.

A valuable addition to this book is Dr. Johns' introduction. His mild, ironical criticism is an antidote against the influence of Pan-Babylonism, and at the same time a warning to its opponents not to dismiss it by ignorance in contemptuous condemnation.

It is surprising to see scholars, so well-acquainted with events in the most remote antiquity, and occurrences in the starry heaven, knowing so little about what happens everyday about them, being ignorant of Jewish customs practised everywhere by religious Jews. Fancy only that "among orthodox Jews, mothers still teach their sons to take off their caps to the new-moon!" (vol. I, p. 45, n. 2). The author does not know that an orthodox Jew never uncovers his head in holy places and in the presence of holy objects, and not about קִרְשׁ הַלְבָנָה which has its origin in moon-worship. Scholars ought to mix more carefully the stagnant waters of the Euphrates and Nile with the still flowing spring-water of Jewish life and religious practice.

Die Sprache der Amarnabriefe mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Kanaanismen, Von Dr. phil. FRANZ M. Th. BOEHL. (*Leipziger Semitistische Studien*, V, 2. Herausgegeben von A. FISCHER und H. ZIMMERN). Leipzig: I. C. HINRICHS'sche BUCHHANDLUNG, 1909. pp. 96.

Kanaanäer und Hebräer. Untersuchungen zur Vorgeschichte des Volkstums und der Religion Israels auf dem Boden Kanaans. Von FRANZ BOEHL, Lic. theol., Dr. phil. (*Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten Testament*. Herausgegeben von RUDOLPH KITTEL, Heft 9.) Leipzig: I. C. HINRICHS'sche BUCHHANDLUNG, 1911. pp. 118.

The most important information we possess about the condition of pre-Israelite Canaan is found in the tablets discovered in Tell-el-Amarna, in Egypt, in the year 1887. Their significance lies not only in their contents which is eminently of historical value, but also in themselves. Though many of them consist of letters of governors and rulers of Canaan addressed to the king of Egypt, the script and language in which they are written are cuneiform and Babylonian. It shows that Canaan was strongly influenced by the Babylonian civilization. But the style of writing and language differ considerably from that of the cuneiform texts in Babylonia. It sheds light upon the identity of the Canaanite population. On the one hand a considerable number of glosses—Canaanite translations of Babylonian words and ideograms—, verbal forms and expressions that in Babylonian proper are impossible and can only be explained by comparing West-Semitic dialects, prove that Canaan was inhabited by West-Semites. On the other hand, in some of the letters occur many words and personal names that are non-Semitic, and it shows again that Canaan's Semitic population was interspersed with foreign elements. If we believe that Israel's culture and religion grew up on the soil of Canaan—an opinion shared by all critics,—the facts that Canaan was inhabited by a mixed population and that the cast of the Canaanite culture was Babylonian would be of fundamental interest for the history of Israel's religion. For this purpose we have to investigate two points: With what layers of nations have we to deal in the pre-Israelite Canaan? And what were their relations to the Babylonians on the one hand, to the Hebrews on the other hand? The main source for such an investigation are the Amarna-letters, and it can only be conducted upon a linguistic basis.

The first of the present volumes points out and discusses all the linguistic peculiarities of the Amarna-letters, dealing with the style of writing, phonology, morphology, syntax, and the Canaanisms. Of special interest is the part describing the verbal forms, where we are shown the strong influence of the Canaanite language upon the Babylonian formation, in the permansive, the inflections, and the hybrid forms. It is a very useful work, and will be greatly appreciated by students interested in this subject. Though it does

not require any amount of ingenuity to arrive at exactly the same conclusions, especially with the help of Knudtzon's splendid transliteration and translation of the Amarna-letters, the basis of this work, the merit of this book, however, is to have given the complete material to all the forms under discussion, and by this index, the study of this subject is greatly facilitated.

The second volume deals with historical problems, mentioned above. The author does not claim to have arrived at definite results, but merely aims to give a complete collection of the extant material, concerning the Canaanites, Hittites, Amorites, and Hebrews in the cuneiform, Egyptian, Greek-Phœnician, and biblical sources.

The author holds that the names Canaanites and Amorites are not geographical, but ethnographical terms. The latter were Semites and had the whole Westland in possession, reaching to the borders of Babylonia, already in a very early period. But a non-Semitic immigration, from North and East, of the Hittites, consisting of a group of nations of different races and languages, at the time of the first Babylonian dynasty, brought into Palestine the Canaanites, a branch of the Hittites. They settled down in the most fertile part of the country, in the valleys and on the coast and confined the former inhabitants of the country, the Amorites, to the mountainous regions and the Negeb. The same opinion was expressed by the present writer in his review of Clay's "Amurru" (see *JQR.*, New Series, vol. I, p. 150).

In the Amarna-period, however, a new Semitic immigration swept over the country, the *Ha-bi-ri* = עֲבָרִים, of which Israel formed a branch. But the foundation upon which this contention rests is extremely frail. There is no necessity to assume that the term *Ha-bi-ri* comprises besides Israel other cognate tribes. Israel could have assisted Amorite princes of the Lebanon against Phœnician cities. And as to *ilāni ḥa-ab-bi-ri* 'the gods of the Hebrews' mentioned in the treaties, it exactly corresponds to אֱלֹהֵי הָעֲבָרִים.

In the last chapter, the author discusses the two different methods for the understanding of Israel's religion, the method of

the higher critics, as first applied by Kuenen, and that of Winckler, and contends that each separately is bound to be one-sided, and only a combination of both will give us a true picture of Israel's religion. Its starting point was in the desert of Kadesh, outside of the centers of culture, like Christianity and other religious movements. The influence of the Babylonian culture upon the religion of Kadesh corresponds to the influence of Hellenism upon the shaping of Christianity. Both influences, though contributing to the development of the respective religions, were only superficial.

The present writer differs from the author in many points. He does not believe with Kuenen, Wellhausen, etc. that Israel's religion grew out of primitive peasant religious conceptions. Nor does he admit that the religion of Kadesh was developed under Canaanite-Babylonian influence. But he contends that Israel's tribes, being descendants of those who emigrated from Canaan, and originally from Babylonia, undoubtedly must have been in possession of the Canaanite-Babylonian culture. It accordingly was the fundamental basis upon which the edifice of Israel's religion was erected. The task of the Sinaitic legislation consisted merely in purging, and purifying, and here and there suppressing the old Canaanite-Babylonian religious conceptions. We must always keep in mind that Israel did not immigrate into Canaan, but returned to its old home. Hellenism, however, was not the basis of Christianity, and its influence, without having a destructive effect, was bound to be only superficial. It would have been more logical to draw a parallel between Judaism and Hellenism, shaping and modifying old religious conceptions.

The main value of this book consists in the collection of the material concerning the pre-Israelite inhabitants of Canaan which confirms the biblical records, not in its deductions.

Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament. Translated and edited by ROBERT WILLIAM ROGERS, Ph. D. (Leipzig), Litt. D., LL. D., F. R. G. S., Professor in Drew Theological Seminary. New York: EATON & MAINS, 1912. pp. 562 + 48 photographic illustrations and a chronological table.

Keilschriftliches Urkundenbuch zum Alten Testament in Urschrift.

Zusammengestellt, autographiert und herausgegeben von Dr. A. SARSOWSKY. Mit einem Wörter-und Eigennamenverzeichnis von Dr. M. SCHÖRR, Privatdozenten an der Universität in Lemberg. I. Teil: Historische Texte. Leiden: E. J. BRILL, 1911. pp. 71.

THESE two volumes, though not bringing forward any new material, are extremely useful. They supply a real need, and will, therefore, be duly appreciated by many students, especially those whose interest in Assyriology is limited to those documents which shed light upon the Old Testament. For these texts are widely scattered in many rather expensive works and thus not easily accessible and it is, moreover, a laborious task to collect all the data illustrative of the Bible.

The first volume by Professor Rogers contains mythological, liturgical, doctrinal, chronological, historical, and legal texts, transcribed and translated, besides the parallels from classic writers, in Greek and translation. It offers the largest collection of cuneiform texts necessary for biblical exegesis, yet published in any language. Of special value is the historical part, as the author, well known as a reliable historian, prefaces the texts with brief historical introductions. The chronological table is up to date. It is, however, incomplete, as the approximate dates of the pre-Hammurabi period ought to have been given as well. But the value of this book does not only consist in its contents, but also in its omissions. The author does not thresh out all sensational theories and make every possible comparison with the Old Testament, but only supplies the material and lets the student exercise his own judgment upon it. The translations are in many cases superior to those of previous editions by others. We regret, however, that we cannot give equal praise to all the transliterations. The present writer has compared the chronological texts with the original and found not a few errors and misprints. Variants and even apparent scribal errors ought not to have been omitted. Why not give an exact transliteration of the proper names in the Assyrian Eponym List? The Author having used Delitzsch's *Assyrische Lesestücke*, zweite Auflage, as indicated in the footnote

(p. 219), there was no reason, why the list should be incomplete.³

These slight inaccuracies might easily have been corrected by careful proof-reading, and the author seems to be well aware of these imperfections, perhaps better than the reviewer, and expresses it in his Preface, in saying that this work has cost him so much that his early hopes and enthusiasm for it have slipped away. It shows, however, how precarious it is to rely upon transliterations.

The second volume, therefore, will be heartily welcomed by students who are able to read cuneiform. The historical texts it contains are for the most part identical with those given by Professor Rogers, in the chronological and historical sections. It

³ In the Babylonian Chronicle: Col. I, 6: *Rab-bi-ku* read *Rab-bi-lu*; 23: *Tukulti-apal-e-shar-ra*, original: *Tukulti-apal(āsh)-e-shar-ra*; 40 (translation): *Ishtar-kundu* read *Ishtar-khundu*; Col. II, 3: *iḫliḫ* (ḪA-A); 28: *ra-bu-ti-shu* read *rabu-ti-shu*; Col. III, 3: *is-ḫu-shu-mu* read *is-ḫu-shu-ma*; 31: *Ḫum-ma-ḫal-da-shu* original: *Ḫum-ma-AN-da-shu* (AN scribal error or = *il* = *al* and cf. *Um-man-al-da-si?*); 13: XVIII read VIII; 35: *iḏāk[-shu]* read *iḏāk-shu*; Col. IV, 12: *Ḫum-ma-ḫal-da-shu* original: *Ḫum-ma-an-da-shu*; 24: after *illikū* insert (*ḫi-bi*); 25: after *dīkat* insert, according to Duplicate 2, *mārat-su shal-lat ilāni-shu i-tab-ku*; 28: *ul-tal-lu-ni* read *ish-tal-lu-ni*. The Assyrian Eponym List: 825 *Shamash-upahir* read *Shamash-upakhhkir*; 861 *Nergal-is-ka-u-danni-in* read *Nergal-is-ka-udanni(KAL)-in*; 850 *Hadil-ebushu* read *Kha-di-li-bu-shu*; 830 *Khu-bak-ba-ai* read *Khu-ba-a[i]*; 829 *Ilu-mukin-aki* read *Ilu-mukin-akhi*; 820 *Ninib-upakhhkir* read *Ninib-ub-la*; 762 *Sab-Bel* read *Ṭab-Bêl*; 720 *Asshur-is-ka-udannis* read *Asshur-is-ka-udanni-in*; 712 *Sharru-limuranni* read *Sharru-c-murani-ni*; There are nine lines (not: some lines) wanting, containing of course the Eponyms of 665-657, and the original Col. VI, 256-265 gives following names: (656) *Sha-Nabū-shu-u*, (655) *La-ba-si*, (654) *Mil-ki-ra-mu*, (653) *Am-ia-a-nu*, (652) *Asshur-naṣi-ir* (651) *Asshur-malik*, (650) *Assur-dūr-uṣur*, (649) *Sa-gab-bu*, (648) *Bêl-ellat(shad?)(-u)-a*, (642) *Bêl(?) -Malik(?)*. In the names at the end of the List: *Bêl-na'i'd* read *Bêl-na-'i-di*; *Tabu* read *Ṭab-shar-Sin*; *Silim Asshur*, better: *Lishir-Asshur*. The Assyrian Eponym List with notes: 855 *Asshur-ina-ekalli-lilbur* read *Abu-ina-ekalli-lilbur*; *Asshur-takkil* read *Asshur-tak-lak*; 798 *Lu-u-si-a* read *Lu-u-shi-a*; 792 *erini* read *e-ri-ni*; 770 *Ma-ra-ad* original *shu-ra-ad*; 766 *Til-li-e* read *Til-e*; 743 *dīkat* read *di-kat* 731 *Sa-pi-ia* read *Sha-pi-ia*; 707 *sha Ashur-du-ub-bu* read *Sha-Ashur-du-ub-bu*; *sharru ishtu(ana?) Babilī* read [*šarru ishtu(ana?) Babilī*]; 704 *epi-esh* read *e-pi-esh*. The Babylonian Kings List: A: *Zamamu-shum-iddin* read *Za-ma-ma-shum-iddin*; B: to *Adara-kalama* add: son of the former.

has also a short useful glossary—an advantage which we badly miss in Rogers's work. The present writer has examined most of the texts, especially the Amarna-letters, comparing them with those published by Winckler, and found them to be in every respect faultless. It is to be hoped that the author will soon publish the promised second part, containing the religious and mythological texts. We need especially an edition of the Creation-tablets and the Gilgamish-epic in which all the fragments are pieced together, with the probable restorations.

Bismya or The Lost City of Adab. A story of adventure, of exploration and of excavation among the ruins of the oldest of the buried cities of Babylonia. By EDGAR JAMES BANKS, Ph. D., Field Director of the Expedition of the Oriental Exploration Fund of the University of Chicago to Babylonia. With 174 illustrations. New York: G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, 1912. pp. 455, with a map.

This volume is justly designated by the author as a story, as it describes in a popular way the discoveries made by him in the Babylonian mound of Bismya and has been especially written for the general reader who is interested in days and things long passed. It dwells, therefore, at full length on many things well known to the scholar. As a story, it is a very entertaining and instructive book which one would like to read through at a single sitting. The scholar, however, is less interested in the esthetic beauty of the description and the author's adventures and travels than in the results of the Expedition, which are given in chapters XI-XVIII. The most important discovery was a statue of a king which showed that the place of the excavation was once the ancient city of Adab. The inscription on it was published and translated in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, XXI, p. 59 and reads, according to the author: 1) *E-sar* (MAḤ) 2) *lugal Da-udu* 3) *lugal Ud-nu Ki* "(The temple) *E-sar* (or *E-Mah*), king David, king of Adab," and he remarks that the appearance of the name *Da-udu* may end the discussion as to the derivation of the biblical name David. But the reading of the name is not only quite improbable, as the sign for *udu* has the syllabic value *lu* and

dib, but simply impossible. In the first place, the title "king" can neither in Sumerian nor in Babylonian precede the proper name. In the second place, *Da-udu*, if Sumerian, could only mean "with a sheep" or, "with me is a sheep," and thus be, as a proper name out of place. But we can neither agree with Thureau-Dangin (*SAK.*, p. 152) who reads: "1) *E-sar* 2) *shar rum da-lu* 3) *shar Adab ki* and translates "*Esar*, the mighty king, king of Adab," as the suggestion that *da-lu* stands for *da-num* "mighty" is too daring. We believe, therefore, that the name of this king was *Lugal-da-lu*—just as good a name as *Lugal-anda*, *Lugal-kisal-si*, *Lugal-zag-gi-si*, etc., etc.—*E-sar*—so of course, not *E-mah*—means "the temple of the park" = *Bit kiri*. This temple may have been situated in the precincts of the temple *E-Mah*. The latter was restored by Hammurabi (Code, Col. III, 69) and is also mentioned in the copper tablet inscription, discovered at Bismya. But it is more probable, as we shall see, that both *E-sar* and *E-mah* are identical and synonymous. The name of the *pa-te-si* found in the above mentioned inscription is to be read *E-igi-nim-sig-è*, not—as the author reads—*E-she-ul-pa-ud-du*, which may be translated into Semitic *Bit-Elamti-Shûpu* "the house of Elam is excellent" and suggest some connection of this ruler with Elam. On *igi-nim* = *Elamtu* see Brün. 9376. The characters on this inscription are identical with those on the Obelisk of Manishtusu (about 2700 B. C.), and may thus be pre-Sargonic and not belong to a period between Narâm-Sin and Ur-Engur, as the author believes. As the author does not say anything about its contents, the present writer will do so, tentatively. It reads:

Col. I 1) <i>Dingir Mah</i>	For the goddess Bêlit (?),
2) <i>E-igi-nim-sig-è</i>	has this <i>E-igi-nim-sig-è</i> ,
3) <i>ni pa-te-si</i>	the sovereign-priest
4) <i>Ud-nunki</i>	of the city of Adab,
5) <i>E-Mah mu-na-dú</i>	the temple <i>E-Mah</i> built;
Col. II 1) <i>gim-bi ki-shu</i>	by its architect, on the place,
2) <i>temen ba-sig</i>	the <i>temen</i> was laid.

On *dingir Mah* = *Bêlit* see Muss-Arnolt, Dictionary, p. 120. But as *mah* is the usual ideogram for *šîru* "exalted," *dingir-mah*

could be = *Anum šīrum* "the exalted Anu," cf. Code of Hammurabi, Col. I, 1. The first suggestion, however, is more probable, as *Nin-har-sag*, mentioned in Dungi's Brick-inscription, to whom the temple *E-Maḥ* or a part of it, was dedicated, and who by Ur-Bau is called "mother of the gods" (see *SAK.*, p. 60, 3, 8) appears indeed to have been identified with Bēlit of Nippur. Thus *dingir Maḥ* would be identical with *Nin-har-sag*, and *E-Maḥ* would mean—not the great temple—but the Temple of Maḥ i. e. *Bēlit*.—To the particle *ni* = *shū* "this," affixed to *E-igi-nim-sig-è*, comp. *Gu-de-a-ni* "this Gudea" (Cylinder, passim).—On *gim* = architect, cf. Code of Hamur., XXXV, 56.—*ki-shū* = *ana ashri*: "to the place."—To *sig*, in connection with *temen* (TE), cf. Gudea Cylinder, A, XI, 18: *ud temen-mu ma-si-gi-na*. For the function of *ba* as passive prefix, see Langdon's *Sumerian Grammar*, § 189.

The author's translation of the Brick inscription is in the most important point wrong. It reads as follows:

1) <i>dingir Nin-har-sag</i>	For the goddess <i>Nin-har-sag</i> ,
2) <i>Nin-a-ni</i>	his mistress,
3) <i>Dun-gi</i>	has Dungi,
4) <i>niṭaḥ kalag-ga</i>	the mighty man,
5) <i>lugal Uru-ki-ma</i>	the king of Ur,
6) <i>lugal Ki-en-gi</i>	the king of Shumer,
<i>ki-Uri-ge</i>	and of Akkad,
7) <i>gish kesh-du</i>	the (temple-)park,
8) <i>kenag-ni</i>	her beloved one,
9) <i>mu-na-dú</i>	(lit. for her, he) made.

The author translates *gish kesh-du* by "platform." But the fact that *kesh-du* is preceded by *gish*, the determinative for wood, ought to have shown him that the object which Dungi dedicated to his goddess, was made of wood, not a brick-platform. Besides the word for platform is *kisal*. In all probability, however, the signs for *keshda* and *sar*, which in a later period became in the script identical, have a cognate meaning, as *keshda* = *rakāsu* "to bind," and *sher*, *ser*, unquestionably identical with *sar*, = *kašāru* "to bind" (see Muss-Arnolt, *Dictionary*, a. 1.). Prince (*Sumerian Lexicon*, p. 313), therefore, rightly assumes that the meaning of both comes

from the idea "thick growth of the forest," the meaning of *sar* "forest, park" = *kirū*. Thus *keshta* alone has the secondary meaning "to bind," but *gish kesh-da* is a synonym of *gish sar* = *kirū* "park." If so, the *gish kesh-du* which Dungi dedicated would be identical with the temple *E-sar* which, as we have seen, means "the temple of the park." It would be indeed surprising that Dungi should not have mentioned the temple *E-sar* or *E-Mah*. We see now that he did, but used a different expression. The gold inscription of Narām-Sin is of special interest, as it appears to confirm the fact that this king was indeed deified. The author did not notice it. It reads:

- | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| 1) <i>Na-ra-am dingir En-zu</i> | Naram-Sin, |
| 2) <i>lugal</i> | the king |
| 3) <i>A-ga-deki</i> | of Akkad, |
| 4) <i>dingir uru-ge</i> | the god of the city, |
| 5) ... <i>sub</i> (KA + SHU) | prayer |
| 6) [<i>lu</i>]gal... | king (?) |

For *dingir-uru-ge* cf. *ilu Na-ra-am-ilu Sin ilu Akkadimki* (SAK., p. 168).

The legend on the boat-shaped vase reads:

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| 1) <i>Nin dingir...</i> | To the mistress, the goddess... |
| 2) <i>Ur dingir En [-lil]</i> | has <i>Ur-Enlil</i> , |
| 3) <i>dumu Ur dingir Lugal-edin-son of Ur-Lugal-edin-na,</i>
<i>na (!)</i> | |
| 4) <i>nam-til-la-[ni]-shu-</i> | for his wife |
| 4) <i>a mu-na-[ru]</i> | dedicated |

For *Lugal-edin-na* "the king of the desert" see Brünnow 4530.

The author ought to have told us the meaning of the Vase inscription of Bar-ki, king of Kish, as it might show whether this king was a Sumerian, or a Semite like Uru-mush and Manishtusu. The other Vase inscription of this king (p. 266) reads:

- | | |
|----------------------|-------------------|
| 1) <i>Bar-ki</i> | <i>Bar-ki</i> , |
| 2) <i>lugal kish</i> | the king of Kish, |

- 3) *dumu kenag* the beloved son
- 4) [N]in-har-sag dingir... of Nin-har-sag, the goddess
- 5)

Personal Names from Cuneiform Inscriptions of the Cassite Period, By ALBERT T. CLAY, William M. Laffan Professor of Assyriology and Babylonian Literature, Yale University. (*Yale Oriental Series*, I,) New Haven: YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1912. pp. 208.

The Assyrian language expresses the idea of "bringing into existence" by the phrase *shumu nabû* "to give a name." The truth of this metaphor found its best confirmation in modern research. Many fundamental theories and conclusions concerning the history, culture, and religious conceptions of the Mesopotamian people, owe either their very existence to proper names, or have been first suggested by them, and were subsequently found to be true. The importance of this material has been generally recognized long ago. In recent years, three Name-Books, comprising all the names of certain periods, have been published, and it is also customary to give indices of proper names with text publications.

There is no period in which proper names would more contribute to the solving of historical problems, than that of the Cassites. We have no documentary information concerning the origin of this people, and where they came from, knowing only that Cassite rulers held sway over Babylonia for a period of about 700 years. This historical question can only be solved by means of the proper names, which seem indeed to indicate that there was a certain linguistic relationship between the Cassites and Hittites. If this fact should be confirmed, the former may have been among the Hittites who, as it seems, invaded Babylonia in the reign of Samsu-ditana, and were responsible for the overthrow of the first Babylonian dynasty. The first step toward solving this problem is a survey of the whole material of Cassite proper names.

Professor Clay, who for many years has made a special study of proper names, the results of which are embodied in the valuable introductions and indices to his Cassite and Neo-Babylonian text publications, is unquestionably an authority on this subject. His

present volume, containing all the proper names of the Cassite period which are at present accessible to us is a valuable work in every respect, and will serve as a reliable basis for further investigations. Apart from the Cassite names, the meaning of which, for the most part, is still obscure, and the Hittite-Mitani names, the full appreciation of which will be obtained, when the language of the Hittites is understood, the book greatly contributes to Semitic philology, as it largely deals with Semitic names of that period. The Table, showing the different theophorous name formations, is highly useful for the reading of ideographically written proper names. The many suggestions in the list of elements deserve serious consideration. The present writer, however, has some doubts, whether all the elements enumerated in the Cassite-group are Cassite. If the element *Gal-zu* belongs to this group, we would have to assume that Cassites lived in Babylonia a thousand years before they became the ruling people of this country, as we find bearers of the names *Gal-zu-daian*, *Gal-zu-ilu* and *Gal-zu*, on the Obelisk of Manisthusu (about 2700 B. C.). And even the element *na-zi*, which in the Cassite-Babylonian Vocabulary is translated by *šillu* "shade, protection," is found there in the hypocoristicon *Na-zi-tim*. It is not surprising to find the same elements in the Hammurabi period, in *Damu-gal-zu*, *Ilu-na-zi*, for at that time Cassites were indeed in Babylonia, as we know from the Dilbat inscriptions, published by Ungnad.

Tiglath Pileser III. By ABRAHAM S. ANSPACHER, Ph. D. (*Contributions to Oriental History and Philology*, No. V.). New York: COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1912. pp. 72.

The reign of Tiglath-pileser the Third—or as we ought to say now, the Fourth—was not only of great importance for the Assyrian empire, as his accession gave a new lease of life to this scourge of the world, but also fateful for Israel, as it was this king to whom Ahaz of Judea applied for help, and his interference was fraught with disaster for the Northern Tribes of Israel. The present volume deals at length with all the details of the life and history of this king.

The special aim of the author is to fix, by the aid of all the available historical inscriptions which are very fragmentary, the

geographical localities and the routes of march of this king's campaigns. In this respect, the author has greatly contributed to a better knowledge of ancient geography. The discussion of many historical points concerning the antecedents of this king's accession and the political condition of Assyria are also noteworthy, though in some parts there may be more fancy than truth. We notice, however, that the author overlooks the fact that the first month of the year in Assyria, at that time at least, was not *Nisan* but *Iyyar*; and as Tiglath-pileser ascended the throne 745 B. C., on the 13th (not 12th) of *Iyyar*, he was justified in considering it as a full calendar year of his reign. As we see, no satisfactory explanation for *Pulu*, the Babylonian name of Tiglath-pileser is forthcoming. If we may assume a root *pēlu* "to subdue"—as has been done, though it is doubtful—the present writer would see in *Pulu* a per-mansive form of the Pa"el *Pu'ulu* "the conqueror" which subsequently became *Pulu*.

Ancient Assyria. By C. H. W. JOHNS, Litt. D., Master of St. Catharine's College, Cambridge. (*The Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature.*) Cambridge: at the UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1912. pp. 172, with 13 illustrations and two maps.

The name of Johns, well known as a careful and moderate scholar, is in itself a full guarantee for the reliability of the present volume which contains a brief history of Assyria. It indeed presents an up-to-date history, in which the latest results are embodied. It will, therefore, be useful, not only to the general reader, for whom the Cambridge Manuals are chiefly intended, but also to students well acquainted with the earlier works on Assyrian history, by Tiele, Hommel, Winckler, etc., as these works have been rendered nearly obsolete, by recent discoveries. The *Deutsche Orientgesellschaft*, which since 1903 has been exploring the site of the ancient capital Ashur, has nearly doubled the number of monarchs of Assyria known to us. It is rather annoying to learn that Shalmaneser II. of the Black Obelisk is to be termed Sh. III., Tiglathpileser III. was T. IV., etc., etc. But Assyriology is in this respect no exception. It shares the fate of all sciences in which theories are being continually upset and displaced by facts. And even this work is only of ephemeral value. Any day may bring

more information and the history will have to be re-written and studied again. We notice that the illustration to page 66, representing the statue of Ashur-našir-pal is, by some mistake, ascribed to the first bearer of this name (a contemporary of the Babylonian king Adad-shum-ušur, about 1250 B. C.). It is of course the statue of the great Ashur-našir-pal III, as the inscription, which gives the genealogy of this king shows.

Mesopotamian Archaeology. An Introduction to the archaeology of Babylonia and Assyria. By PERCY S. P. HANCOCK, M. A. With numerous illustrations, also maps. New York: G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, 1912. pp. 423.

In this volume the author attempts to give an account of the civilization of ancient Babylonia and Assyria, in the light of the new material which has been made accessible to us since the publications of the pioneers in the field of excavation and research. The attempt is, as a whole, successful, and this book may, at present, be regarded as the standard-work on Babylonian and Assyrian archaeology. The fourteen chapters, into which the book is divided, deal with all the subjects which go to make up the civilization of any country.

The first chapter traces the origin of the Sumerian, holding as probable that they emigrated from Elam, describes the physical characteristics of the country, the soil, the various kinds of trees and cereals which flourished there, and the animals the people were familiar with, discusses the date of the arrival of the Semites in the Mesopotamian Valley, and gives a sketch of Babylonian-Assyrian history. The following three chapters give a historical review of the excavations, describe in a very clear and precise way the decipherment of the cuneiform writing, its pictorial origin and the materials used for the purposes of writing.

Chapters V-XII deal with architecture, sculpture, metallurgy, cylinder-seals, shell-engraving and ivory-work, terra-cotta figures and reliefs, and stoneware and pottery. The use of stone, as a building accessory, dates from the most ancient Sumerian times. Though Babylonia is as poor in wood as it is in stone, there is sufficient evidence for the use of wood as building material, in all

periods. Metal seems to have been added more for the adornment of the conspicuous parts of the buildings, than used as an integral part of the structure. As to the general plan of Sumerian temples, we are still in a state of ignorance. Other buildings of a secular character have been preserved in a more satisfactory state. Of the arrangement of private houses, we know comparatively little. The column never seems to have occupied a prominent position in the architecture—a fact which was again due to the dearth of stone and wood. To the same is owing the general use of the arch, which was indispensable to a people whose building materials were of small size.

Concerning sculpture, the bas-relief was the favorite and the most successful expression of the artistic genius of both Babylonians and Assyrians. For the study of early Sumerian sculpture in the round, we have not much material at hand, for what they excelled in, they practised most. It was not till the age of Gudea that sculpture in the round assumed a prominent part in the artistic life of the people. In the art of working metals the Babylonians showed no small degree of proficiency. The metals which appear to have been most in use are copper and bronze. The copper age commenced in Mesopotamia at a very early period. Gold was only used for exceptional purposes. The same was the case with silver. Lead was used both in unmixed state and as an alloy. Iron was first known in its meteoric state.

The Mesopotamian dwellers, like all Orientals, were fond of gay colors, and gratified their taste for such in various ways, but no attempt was made to faithfully represent the objects of nature, and the colors they frequently used were, from the naturalistic standpoint, entirely impossible. The colors chiefly employed are blue, yellow and white, while green, red and black are of rare occurrence. The background of the picture is generally a shade of royal blue.

The engraved seals which kings and commoners used alike, was an indispensable convenience of civilized society in primitive times. The materials used in their manufacture were serpentine, marble, quartz crystal, chalcedony, carnelian, agate, jasper, syenite, jade, obsidian, onyx, limestone, schist, mother of emerald and amethyst. The interest of the seals is of course centered in the

scenes depicted which elucidate many legendary uncertainties in the Babylonian religious conceptions. The art of engraving on shell dates back to the earliest period, ivory, however, not being procurable in Mesopotamia, was not used till the people extended their power outside. From this time, they were able to command a supply of this precious substance. Terra-cotta being comparatively fragile, and durability being one of the most important considerations of the artists, this material was not employed so frequently for objects of a votive character, as might have been expected. Various kinds of stone were used as materials for making bowls and vases from the earliest Sumerian days.

The two last chapters describe dress, military accoutrements, life, manners, customs, law and religion. The full dress of the earliest Sumerians comprised nothing more elaborate than a skirt fastened round the waist and probably made of wool. The head of the majority of the figures on the early sculptures is hairless and beardless. The dress of early Sumerian women is somewhat uncertain. From the earliest times, marriage was regarded in the light of a legal contract. Polyandry was evidently not unknown. Women were employed as weavers, gate-keepers and hairdressers. The trades pursued by men were numerous. The fertility of the soil naturally encouraged its cultivation. Part of the land belonged to the royal domains, the remainder being occupied by private individuals. The work of irrigation was undertaken by the state and not left to private enterprise. The gods worshipped in the age of Gudea (B. C. 2450) were known and venerated in the time of Uru-ka-gina (B. C. 2800). Many of the laws of Hammurabi's Code show little or no variation from those in force, if not actually systematized, in the time of Uru-ka-gina.

The chief sources for the study of Babylonian symbolism are the cylinder-seals, the Babylonian Boundary-Stones, and the monoliths of Assyrian kings. The winged disc is clearly symbolic of Ashur. But the Babylonian boundary-stones provide more material for the study of Babylonian symbolism. In the last few pages the author discusses Babylonian eschatology and gives a short bibliography.

This book is, as we said above, of capital importance. But the author ought to have expressed himself with more reserve, in

dealing with life, customs and religion of the early Sumerians, as far as their description is exclusively based on inscriptions. Our knowledge of the Sumerian language is still in its infancy, and we may be wide of the mark in many interpretations of early Sumerian inscriptions. They are for the time being merely more or less probable suggestions and ought not to be represented as indisputable facts.

From the author's descriptions we gain the impression that Babylonian culture was exclusively derived from the Sumerians and that the Semites did not contribute anything noteworthy towards it. This is hardly fair. In point of religion, at least, the Semites whom we find in the country as a ruling people about 300 years before the age of Gudea, unquestionably influenced and modified the conceptions of the Sumerians. In an Archeology we would expect a discussion about the original home of the Hammurabi-dynasty, whether they were South-Arabians or West-Semites.

We are not convinced by the author's arguments that the original home of the Sumerians was the Elamite plateau. The early Sumerian seals do not prove anything in this respect. Considering the mountains as the seats of the gods, they naturally depicted the animals and trees found in them as sacred symbols. Besides it is very improbable that the Sumerian civilization had its origin in Elam. The primitive religious and mythological conceptions point to Eridu as the earliest settlement of the Sumerians and the cradle of their civilization.

Sumerian Tablets in the Harvard Semitic Museum. Part I, chiefly from the reign of Lugalanda and Urukagina of Lagash. Copied with introduction and index of names of persons by MARY INDA HUSSEY, Ph. D. (*Harvard Semitic Series*, volume III.) Cambridge, U. S. A.: HARVARD UNIVERSITY, 1912. pp. 36, plates of autographed texts 75, and photographed reproductions 6.

The texts published in this volume belong to a very early period, approximately 2800 B. C., to the reigns of *Lugal-an-da*,

sovereign-priest of Lagash, and his immediate successor(?), *Uruk-ka-gina*, who on his accession to the high-priestly office, made himself king of this city. The tablets for the most part contain accounts of the palace and temple expenses. Though nine-tenths of the contents consist of proper names and numerals and in recent years many texts of exactly the same period and the same character have been published, they are nevertheless of great value. They contain many signs not identified yet and thus offer new problems in palaeography. The proper names are of course of great importance. So are the names of the months. But text editions of this kind ought not to be published without a list of the signs. The author should have explained the meaning of the Sumerian series designations. The arrangement of the columns, in the obverse from left to right and in the reverse from right to left, is confusing and unnecessary. The introduction, in which the author dwells at length on the use of the curvilinear and cuneiform numerical notations, is not very satisfactory, as it does not give much help for the reading and understanding of the text.

Dropsie College

JACOB HOSCHANDER

END OF VOLUME III NEW SERIES